



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,167	06/24/2003	Christian Gehrman	P18116-US1	9436
27045	7590	09/23/2008		
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR 1-C-11 PLANO, TX 75024			EXAMINER TRUONG, THANHNGA B	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/23/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/602,167

Applicant(s)

GEHRMANN, CHRISTIAN

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 2 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) _____.
13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Thanhnga B. Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2135

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has asked for an explanation as to why claims 10 and 11 are still directed to non-statutory subject matter. Examiner has maintained the 35 USC 101 rejection and has shown in every previous action as well as in the response to arguments explaining how these claims have been rejected. To make the matter short, in order to overcome the rejection of 101 for these claims, the specification needed to amend in such a way not to include the language, such as, OR from another computer via a computer network (see specification, page 5, lines 6-14). Thus, when the program code can be transmitted VIA A COMPUTER NETWORK, it is transmitted in the form of signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media, etc., which is clearly included intangible media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed. Therefore, claims 10 and 11 recite a non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant and/or Applicant's Representative further argue that:

The combination of teaching between Graveman and Carman for claims 1-5, 7-12 and the combination of teaching between Graveman, Carman, and Shokrollahi for claims 5-6 are improper and would not be obvious to combine these two arts.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant and/or Applicant's Representative and still believes that the combination of teaching between Graveman and Carman teaches the claimed subject matter. In fact, Graveman teaches an approximate message authentication code (AMAC) which, like conventional message authentication codes, provides absolute authentication of the origin of the message, yet provides an approximate integrity check for the content of the message. The approximate integrity check will be computed probabilistically and will likely be the same for messages having only a small percentage of different bits. A distance measure on the AMACs, such as a Hamming distance measure, may be used to determine whether the number of bit differences between the messages is likely to be within an acceptable amount. The AMAC is a probabilistic checksum based on a shared key. The AMAC uses the message and a shared key as inputs (see abstract of Graveman, and more details of claim 1's limitation are taught by Graveman in column 5, lines 13-40; column 6, line 64 through column 7, line 19; column 8, lines 31-35 of Graveman).

Although Graveman teaches the technique to process message authentication code using initial vectors (which is the symbols of the codeword), Graveman is silent on the capability of showing the details of forming a codeword (e.g., message authentication code or data word) and the tag value to be the selected symbol. On the other hand, Carman teaches codeword in column 2, lines 1-11; column 20, lines 57-67 of Carman, and tag value in Figures 1, 17A-17B and more details in column 3, lines 35-43; column 26, lines 25-36 of Carman. Thus, the combination of teaching between Graveman and Carman teaches the claimed subject matter.

The combination of the teaching between Graveman and Carman further teaches the type of error correction code, wherein Reed-Solomon is one kind of error correcting code which defines in terms of finite field. However they are silent on the capability to show the tag value is an element in a finite field (column 5, lines 37-40 of Graveman). On the other hand, Shokrollahi teaches this limitation (as shown in column 1, lines 19-35 of Shokrollahi). Thus, the combination of teaching between Graveman, Carman, and Shokrollahi teaches the claimed subject matter.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, based on the above response, the combination of teaching between Graveman, Carman, and Shokrollahi is proper and efficient.

Graveman, Carman, and Shokrollahi do not need to disclose anything over and above the invention as claimed in order to render it unpatentable or anticipate. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claimed limitations.

The fact that Examiner may not have specifically responded to any particular arguments made by Applicant and Applicant's Representative, should not be construed as indicating Examiner's agreement therewith.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained..

Continuation of 13. Other: Examiner uses the filing date, April 11, 2008, which has been mentioned in "Amendment After Final" and in "Miscellaneous Incoming letter".